

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

In re: MIRAPEX PRODUCTS LIABILITY
LITIGATION

MDL No. 07-1836-MJD-FLN

This document relates to:

Civil No.: 10-cv-1132-MJD-FLN

BRIAN RIDENOUR,

Plaintiff,

**PLAINTIFF'S MEMORANDUM IN
SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S MOTION
TO COMPEL PRODUCTION OF
DOCUMENTS FROM DEFENDANTS**

v.

BOEHRINGER INGELHEIM
PHARMACEUTICALS, INC., a Delaware
corporation; PFIZER INC., a Delaware
corporation; PHARMACIA
CORPORATION, a Delaware corporation;
and PHARMACIA & UPJOHN
COMPANY LLC,

Defendants.

Plaintiff, Brian Ridenour ("Plaintiff"), served Defendants Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Pfizer, Inc., Pharmacia Corporation, and Pharmacia & Upjohn Company, LLC (hereinafter, collectively, the "Defendants") with Plaintiff Brian Ridenour's First Request for Production to Defendants on April 26, 2011. To date, Defendants have not produced any documents responsive or made objections to Plaintiff's production request. Therefore, Plaintiff moves the Court for an order compelling Defendants to produce documents that are responsive to each production request (#1 through #39) contained within Plaintiff's production request.

I. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On June 6, 2011, United States Magistrate Judge Franklin L. Noel issued an Order & Report and Recommendation recommending that Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment should be granted and therefore all claims in Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint should be dismissed with prejudice.¹ Plaintiff filed his objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation on June 20, 2011.² That objection is currently pending before the District Court.

However, prior to the Magistrate Judge's issuance of his Report and Recommendation on June 6, 2011, Plaintiff and Defendants filed a joint motion³ requesting that discovery be stayed and that certain deadlines contained within the Pretrial Schedule⁴ (e.g. discovery deadline and non-dispositive motion deadline) be postponed until the Court made a ruling on Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment. This joint motion was denied as moot in Magistrate Judge Noel's Order & Report and Recommendation. Therefore, while Plaintiff's objections to the Magistrate Judge Noel's Report and Recommendation is pending, Plaintiff moves herein, prior to the July 1, 2011 deadline for such non-dispositive motions, for an order compelling Defendants to produce documents responsive to Plaintiff's production request.

¹ Order & Report and Recommendation, Dkt. No. 106

² Plaintiff's Objection to Magistrate Judge Franklin L. Noel's Report and Recommendation Granting Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment, Dkt No. 107.

³ Joint Motion to Stay Discovery Pending the District Judge's Ruling on Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment, Dkt. No. 104.

⁴ Pretrial Schedule, Dkt. No. 19.

II. ARGUMENT AND AUTHORITIES

Plaintiff is entitled to an order compelling Defendants to provide responses to Plaintiff's request for production of documents. Rule 26 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure set forth general provisions regarding the scope of discovery. Under Rule 26(b)(1), parties may obtain discovery regarding any non-privileged matter that is relevant to the pending action whether it relates to a claim or defense of the party seeking discovery or a claim or defense of any other party. A party may obtain discovery by, amongst other means, requests for production of documents.⁵ The party on whom requests for production are served must provide answer and responses within thirty days of being served.⁶ If that party fails to provide responses, the opposing party may file a motion to compel responses.⁷

Plaintiff served Defendants with Plaintiff Brian Ridenour's First Request for Production to Defendants on April 26, 2011.⁸ A response and/or objections were due on or before May 26, 2011. However, to date, Plaintiff has received neither responsive documents nor objections from any of the Defendants.⁹

III. CONCLUSION

Defendants are delinquent in responding to Plaintiff's request for production of documents. The discovery sought is relevant to the claims and defenses asserted in this action. Plaintiff is entitled to an order compelling discovery.

⁵ Fed. R. Civ. P. 34(a).

⁶ Fed. R. Civ. P. 34(b)(2)(A).

⁷ Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(a)(3)(B).

⁸ See Affidavit of Jon Godoy, ¶3.

⁹ See *Id.* at ¶4.

Dated: June 30, 2011

/s/ Thomas M. Corea

Thomas M. Corea

Texas Bar Number 24037906

Attorneys for Plaintiff Brian Ridenour

The Corea Firm, PLLC

1201 Elm Street, Suite 4150

Dallas, Texas 75270

Telephone: (214) 953-3900

Facsimile: (214) 953-3901

Email: tcorea@corealaw.com